

the muscles of the intestinal tract and maintain normal nutrition; and that it would be efficacious to induce sleep for alcoholic addicts and highly nervous and excitable individuals. The article would not be efficacious for the purposes claimed.

**Alberty Calcium Pantothenate.** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements and designs in the labeling were false and misleading since they represented and implied that the article would prevent hair from turning gray and would change the color of hair that had turned gray. The article would not be efficacious for the purposes claimed.

The articles, with the exception of the *Ri-Co Tablets*, *Alberty's Lebara Pellets*, *Alberty's Sabinol*, *Cheno Herb Tea Laxative*, *Cheno Preparation of Phytolacca Berry Juice*, *Alberty's Lebara No. 2 Pellets*, and *Alberty Calcium Pantothenate*, were alleged also to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in notices of judgment on foods.

**DISPOSITION:** On November 3, 1944, no claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering that the products be destroyed.

**2058. Misbranding of soluble Gelatin Silvertone Capsules. U. S. v. 104 Boxes of Soluble Gelatin Silvertone Capsules. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 21942. Sample No. 65173-H.)**

**LABEL FILED:** December 4, 1946, Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about July 26, 1946, by the Jamco Co., from New York, N. Y.

**PRODUCT:** 104 boxes each containing 24 *Soluble Gelatin Silvertone Capsules* at Philadelphia, Pa. Examination of the product showed that it had the composition stated on the label.

**LABEL, IN PART:** "24 Soluble Gelatin Silvertone Capsules Pennyroyal  $\frac{1}{4}$  Min. Oil Tansy  $\frac{1}{4}$  Min. Apiol Fluid Green  $\frac{1}{4}$  Min. Oil Rue  $\frac{1}{4}$  Min.," or "Oil of Pennyroyal  $\frac{1}{4}$  Min. Oil of Tansy  $\frac{1}{4}$  Min. Apiol Fluid Green  $\frac{1}{4}$  Min. Quinine Sulphate  $\frac{1}{4}$  grain Aloin  $\frac{1}{8}$  grain."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (f) (1), the labeling of the article failed to bear adequate directions for use, since the directions appearing on the labeling failed to indicate the reason for using the article.

**DISPOSITION:** January 14, 1947. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

**2059. Misbranding of Sol-A-Min. U. S. v. 366 Packages of Sol-A-Min. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 20536. Sample Nos. 52567-H to 52569-H, incl.)**

**LABEL FILED:** July 15, 1946, Western District of Kentucky.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about May 20 and June 10 and 11, 1946, by Universal Drug Products, Inc., from Cleveland, Ohio.

**PRODUCT:** 366 assorted 10-ounce and 12-ounce packages of *Sol-A-Min* at Louisville, Ky.

**LABEL, IN PART:** "Sol-A-Min A Vitamin and Mineral Dietary Supplement Including Vitamin B Complex."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (f), the labeling of the article failed to bear adequate directions for use in the diseases and conditions of rheumatism, change of life, and children's colds, for use to effect the purposes of enduing the user with health, energy, pep, vitality, and better eyesight, and for use in preventing diseased tonsils, appendicitis, ulcers, diseased gall bladder, disorders of the glands, and cancer, which were the diseases, conditions, and purposes for which the article was offered in its advertising disseminated and sponsored by and on behalf of its manufacturer or packer.

Further misbranding (10-ounce packages only), Section 502 (c), the common or usual name of each active ingredient required by Section 502 (e) was not prominently placed on the label with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, and devices on the label) as to render such information likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use, since it was in small type and difficult to read, and the other statements and designs were prominently placed on the label.

The article was alleged also to be misbranded under the provisions of the law applicable to foods, as reported in notices of judgment on foods.